will but on native-born American workers' more prominent role in local politics and the greater difficulty of implementing independent political action in America compared to Britain.

Two significant problems mar Babson's work. Much of his analysis of the Anglo-Gaelic, skilled workers' contribution rests on implicit and explicit comparisons to other groups of workers in the industry, especially native-born Americans and eastern European immigrants. Babson's characterizations of these other workers' union efforts, however, are too slim to be convincing. Of course, part of this problem can be attributed to Babson's analytical emphasis. Still, his argument would have benefited from a greater effort to provide details about the reluctance of native-born and eastern European immigrants to take a more active union organizing role.

This problem is related to the larger issue of the ramifications of Babson's findings for historians of labor in this period. Militant activists in many other industries were not foreign-born and not always the most highly skilled. Babson does not attempt to place his findings in a larger context that explains this unevenness. One is also left wondering about what happened to the syndicalism of the 1930s. Babson explains that the Anglo-Gaelic, tool and die makers rejected participation in the New Deal's co-optive liberal welfare state for more confrontational strategies. Yet most workers, especially eastern European unionists as Lizabeth Cohen's *Making a New Deal* (1990) attests, eagerly participated in the New Deal. Babson's book resolves the disappearance of syndicalism chiefly by noting that when other groups became more prominent as leaders of the UAW, their attachments to the New Deal's liberal welfarism eclipsed the political vision of the Anglo-Gaelic unionists. This depiction is too simple. It is more likely that ideological competition among groups of activist workers characterized the union-building struggle from its beginnings as it did in other industries. Gary Gerstle expounds on this theme in his excellent *Working-Class Americanism* (1989).

Scholars should nonetheless pay close attention to Babson's findings. The book carefully and skillfully uncovers the origins and contributions of a leading group of union builders. By painstakingly examining these militant activists, Babson has also raised important questions about the political dimensions of New Deal union organizing.

Wilson J. Warren
University of Pittsburgh

***

Hélène Dionne, dir. — *L'œil amérindien. Regards sur l'animal*. Québec: Musée de la civilisation and Les éditions du Septentrion, 1991. Pp. v, 118.

Keith Tester — *Animals and Society. The Humanity of Animal Rights*. London and New York: Routledge, 1991. Pp. vi, 218.

Our relationship with animals continues to produce a widening literature. One of these books, to accompany a North American museum exhibit, avoids controversy while the other, aimed at philosophers, takes a stance designed to encouraging it. They seem worlds apart, and they are, culturally and philosophically, which is a pity.

Keith Tester's *Animals and Society* is a book not well received in animal liberation circles. The author makes several direct attacks against the work of Peter Singer, who responds equally strongly in the *New York Review of Books* (9 April 1992, pp. 9-13). The book is in part the result of an animal rights backlash, coming in response to Britain's fiery and car-bomb filled public debate over animal liberation. The same press has also recently published Michael P.T. Leahy's *Against Liberation: Putting Animals in Perspective.*

Tester's purpose is quite simple. Through an examination of most of the established canon on animal rights, he sets out to show that animal rights are not about animals at all, but a distinctly and self-serving human construction. However, so is most philosophical thought. By questioning the underlying issues of what animal liberation means to humans, he opens the possibility of a critical debate and guarantees a place for his book in classroom discussion. He is correct in saying that modern animal rights have a class construction — urban and middle class in origin and often used against working-class and rural attitudes. Tester limits himself to this spatial urban/rural distance from animals, ignoring the more important factor of economic dependence. He is quite wrong in saying that the working class had little role on the formation of the debate (119). Coral Lansbury disposed of that chestnut, and began serious discussion on the role of women with her book *The Old Brown Dog: Women, Workers and Vivisection in Edwardian England* in 1985. Indeed, the activists Tester describes as "Kropotkinesque" (190) sound suspiciously more in the tradition of Captain Swing than Kropotkin.

There are some interesting areas avoided by Tester. Historians of animals, and there are some, Robert Delort and Thomas Dunlap to name two, are not used. Stephen Clark seems to have been quoted in a manner to discredit him only on the grounds that his reasoning involves religion (12), a topic Tester avoids for the rest of the book. The intellectual position of professions such as medicine are also avoided, as are the thoughts of the *Royal Commission on Vivisection*, a social construct worthy of philosophic examination.

Tester focuses a great deal on anthropocentricism. It seems to stem from a fondness not for Henry Salt, but for Edward Evans, in whose 1906 work *The Criminal Prosecution and Capital Punishment of Animals. The Lost History of Europe's Animal Trials* anthropomorphism and antropocentric law intertwine. Like Evan's mural of the pig on the gallows, Tester's book uses an anthropomorphic illustration, the cover shows a "scholarly" bear clutching a beer mug, accompanied by his books, painter's palette and faithful dog, lacking only a pipe. But he has confused anthropomorphism with the more relevant word, empathy, a word Philip K. Dick stopped with in his search for a definition of human (155). Tester does not seem to consider that perhaps this is not complicated at all, simply a social awareness of our current industrial relationships with animals. It is unfortunate he could not resist ending his useful discussion with an image of animal liberationists fleeing in fear of the voice of the now liberated Wittgensteinian Lion (of Narnia?). His taunts to Peter Singer seem to be having the response that he appears to have sought, but at the cost of belittling the contribution he sought to make.

L'œil amérindien, edited by Hélène Dionne, is a welcome introduction to the relationship between First Nations and animals. The papers are contributed by Natives, anthropologists and museum curators from Canada, the United States and Mexico. Several papers make an important educational contribution in providing

cross-language (from Spanish and English) summaries of technical articles at a level accessible to the general public and introductory courses.

The contributors present the relationship with animals in a mixture of regional and thematic approaches. Micmac spokesman Viviane Gray introduces the totemic role of animals with First Nations culture, illustrated notably by the animal shape signatures on the minutes of the Niagara Council of 1764. Issues of cosmology, ritual and interaction are discussed by Pierre Beaucage and Hélène Dionne, particularly animals as paths within nature, with the "trickster" animal as an anti-hero educator. Two contributions focus on specific peoples and two on specific animals. Plácido Villanueva Peredo discusses the jaguar, eagle and serpent in Huichol culture north of Jalisco, Mexico, and Diane Dittmore writes on puberty rituals among the Apache of Arizona. Gerald McMaster's light discussion of the horse, named the great dog by the Blackfoot, shows the horse as a cultural intermediary, as part of male culture, and a symbol invoked by white society in marginalizing Natives, through James Earl Fraser's 1894 sculpture *End of the Trail*. Richard Dominique focuses on dreams, medicine and culture through a discussion of divination with the scapula of Caribou.

Despite Céline De Guise's intent on designing a multi-sensory exhibit, the book presents a very static folkloric picture. There is little discussion of change. Controversy is avoided and we hear nothing about the fur trade, game management debates such as the post-1945 state attempt to regulate traditional traplines, the intrusion of retail culture which offered alternatives to tradition, technological modifiers such as the ubiquitous deep freeze, or the impact of the agrarian vision promoted by government representatives. Has the relationship with animals remaned unchanged?

Geographer Henri Dorion's introductory essay gave just emphasis to autochthonic philosophy. The term is precisely apt, stressing plant, animal and humans, not only resident in an area, but literally rising up out of the soil. According to the *Oxford Dictionary*, the term was claimed over a century and a half ago by First Nations to define themselves. This search for identity seems to have a very appropriate place with Rousseau and others in Keith Tester's survey. Perhaps we should consider why this philosophic concept is absent from our debates.

Lorne Hammond
University of Ottawa

***

Louis Lavallée — *La Prairie en Nouvelle-France, 1647-1760*. Montréal et Kingston : McGill-Queen's University Press, 1992, 302 p.

Voici une étude des plus sérieuse en « histoire sociale », ponctuelle certes, mais susceptible de féconder un large ensemble d'enquêtes sur certains microcosmes, dont l'analyse ne fait que commencer.

Dans une style de haute qualité littéraire, l'exposé, bien que technique sur le plan du vocabulaire de l'enquête historique, demeure alerte et passe, allègrement, par la définition nette des institutions en suivant pas à pas la trace et les chemins difficiles d'une très abondante documentation.